MAY 1958

The Reformed Journal

A PERIODICAL OF REFORMED COMMENT AND OPINION

THE WORLD MISSIONARY SITUATION TODAY
Harry R. Boer

THE CHURCH ORDER REVISION
George Stob

ON EDUCATING FOR FREEDOM
Ronald Jager
(Response by Lester DeKoster)

BERKOUWER ON THE IMAGE OF GOD
Anthony A. Hoekema

BOOK REVIEWS

THE VISIBLE WORDS OF GOD

JOSEPH C. McLELLAND. This notable volume is the first English study of the theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli (1500-1562), central figure in the great debate on the Eucharist. Of great import to the understanding of Calvin and English Reformed theology. $4.00

THE GREATEST OF THESE IS LOVE

A. A. VAN RULER. A fresh and stimulating study, by an original and provocative mind, of the N. T. concept of love as set forth in I Cor., 13. $2.00

EZEKIEL: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE

H. L. ELLISON. A scholarly, non-technical study displaying remarkable insight into one of the least understood prophetic books. $2.50

JONATHAN EDWARDS ON EVANGELISM

J. C. WOLF. A digest in Edwards' own words of his sermons and essays which are of special value for evangelism in our time. $2.00

CHRIST IN OUR PLACE

PAUL VAN BUREN. The first critical presentation in English of the Substitutionary Character of Calvin's Doctrine of Reconciliation, the real key to Calvin's theology. $3.00

PAUL'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

E. EARLE ELLIS ". . . of great value for understanding the relation between the O.T. and the mind of Christ as interpreted by Paul . . . a book with genuine claims to scholarship." $3.00

Times Literary Supplement (London)

STANDARD

AT YOUR BOOKSTORE

WM. B. EERDMANS publishing co. Grand Rapids 3 Michigan

The Reformed Journal

A PERIODICAL OF REFORMED COMMENT & OPINION

Volume VIII No.

MAY 1958

Editorial Board

HENRY STOB, HARRY R. BOER, JAMES DAANE
LESTER DEKOSTER, GEORGE STOB

Publisher

William B. Eerdmans, Sr.

THE WORLD MISSIONARY SITUATION TODAY
Dr. Harry R. Boer, *Christian Reformed Church Missionary, Gindiri Training School, Northern Nigeria*

THE CHURCH ORDER REVISION
Dr. George Stob, *Minister of the Prospect Street Christian Reformed Church, Passaic, New Jersey*

ON EDUCATING FOR FREEDOM
Mr. Ronald Jager, *Graduate Student in Philosophy, University of Indiana*

RESPONSE TO MR. JAGER
Mr. Lester DeKoster, *Director of the Library, Calvin College and Seminary*

BERKOUWER ON THE IMAGE OF GOD (I)
Dr. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Associate Professor of Bible, Calvin College*

BOOK REVIEWS

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, excepting August, by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, at 231 Jefferson Avenue, S.E.,, Grand Rapids 3, Michig. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Grand Rapids, Michig.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 25c per copy; $2.50 one year; $4.00 two yea

ADDRESS all subscriptions to Subscription Department, *The Reform Journal*, 231 Jefferson Avenue, S. E., Grand Rapids 3, Michigan. Addr all editorial and advertising communications to Managing Editor and Adv tising Manager respectively.

Managing Editor: Calvin P. Bulthuis; Advertising Manager: David Wynbe

The WORLD MISSIONARY SITUATION Today*

by Harry R. Boer

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH has never been unrelated to but always intimately intertwined with the history of her environment. Political, economic, cultural, and other factors have constantly played vital roles in the life and work of the church. It would be strange if the missionary outreach of the Church were differently conditioned. If anything, conditions prevailing in the environment can be expected to be even more determinative of the nature, scope, manner, and spirit of the missionary task than of the Church at the home base.

The subject of this paper obviously admits of no more than general treatment. It may be hoped, however, that the matters that will be presented will both focus and stimulate missionary interest, deepen concern, and strengthen prayer support for the witness of the church beyond our national borders.

I wish to discuss the contemporary world missionary situation by presenting for your consideration four closely related topics. They are:

I. The Resurgence of the Higher Religions
II. Triumphant Nationalism and the Accompanying Independence of the Younger Churches
III. Missionary Frustration
IV. Theological Education

The Resurgence of the Higher Religions

At the time of the Reformation there seemed little likelihood that Christianity would become a religion reaching out to the large non-European world, much less that it would become a world religion. It was confined to an island, religiously speaking, the island called Europe. To the west by the wide Atlantic which had been crossed with great pain and danger by a few adventurers. To the east lay the great Russian steppes stretching out infinitely to the rising sun. In the north were the artic fields, and to the south lay the Mediterranean bordered along the whole of the North African shore with lands in the hands of Mohammedan power. Christianity was not only thus confined, it was also a wholly Europe-centered religion. There was virtually no missionary vision. It is therefore no overstatement to say that at the beginning of the modern era Christianity was insular in character, and showed no intention of universal outreach.

This situation remained unchanged, so far as any massive Protestant missionary outreach is concerned, until the 1790's. At that time William Carey's appeals and personal departure to India set off the modern missionary era which continued unabated during the whole of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth. It is with unassailable good reason that Latourette calls the nineteenth century, from the missionary point of view, the Great Century.

When the Church entered upon its witness in foreign parts she nowhere entered into a religiously neutral area. Everywhere she met religions that antedated or were nearly as old as the New Testament Church. In all areas these religions were intimately intertwined with historical, cultural, ethnic, and social factors. In the main, the religions that the Church met can be classified into two categories: the higher religions of the more cultured peoples, such as Hinduism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism; and the fetishistic religions of the primitive peoples. In Asia and North Africa the former were prominent, in Africa south of the Sahara, in North America, South America, and Oceania the latter. When I speak of the resurgence of the ancient religions in this article I have mainly the higher cultural religions in mind.

When the missionaries appeared among these peoples, they did not, at least not in the eyes of the non-Christian peoples, come simply as representatives of another religion. They had often been preceded by a conquering Western power, and they brought with them skills, techniques, and knowledge, that were often inseparably linked to their Christianity. Christianity was therefore regarded as coming not only in a religious capacity, but also as coming in a cultural, and even imperialistic context. This view was at times and in important areas encouraged by the missionaries.

So long as the Western power was dominant in the colonial areas the ancient religions could not fully assert themselves. While they nowhere fully surrendered to Christianity, as is evident from the

*This paper was first given as the third lecture in the annual Lecture-Discussion Series sponsored by the Grand Rapids Chapter of the Calvin Alumni Association.

relatively few converts that were gained from them, it is perhaps not unfair to say that for a time they labored under an inferiority complex and manifested the passivity that grows from such a feeling.

This, however, was only a passing phase. Their long tradition, the unity of conception characterizing them, the substantial theological or philosophical basis that undergirded them, and the social contexts in which they existed made eventual reassertion inevitable. The time of this reassertion has now fully come. The weakening and departure of the Western power from the former colonial areas has been accompanied and in no small part caused by a tremendous resurgence and revitalization of the ancient religions. They are providing the religious ideological basis for nationhood and their adherents experience a feeling of triumph over the religion whose Western adherents were unable to maintain their political and cultural dominance.

The significance of this for the Christian mission in the non-Christian lands concerned is profound. Christianity in these lands must now stand without the props provided by colonial prestige which in turn rested ultimately on military and financial power. Christianity now stands in these lands as a distinctly minority religion, and is regarded by many as a hangover from a detested colonialism whose power has been triumphantly and irrevocably broken.

Both the danger and the challenge which this situation presents to the Church will be better understood when we appreciate the nature of the resurgence that has taken place. The resurgence is not a *recrudescence* but a *renaissance*. That is to say, the ancient higher religions are not reasserting themselves in the same form in which Christianity first met them. They have during the long years when Christianity was aggressively reaching out into all corners of the world observed it keenly and learned much from it. They have learned that religion must be world-affirming, not world-fleeing. They have learned that religion must have a message for the men and women tossed about by the revolutionary forces that agitate their world. They are therefore re-interpreting the Koran, the Buddhist, and the Hindu sacred scriptures to make them speak to the masses caught up in the social, political, and economic upheavals of this day.

The resurgence is accompanied, moreover, by the adoption or adaptation of characteristic techniques of Christianity, notably preaching, teaching, literature work, and missionary outreach. In fact, the ancient religions are asserting a universal validity and there are beginnings of their witness in some of the larger cities of the West.

The resurgence of the higher religions is there fore a rebirth, a radical adaptation of old belief to new needs, and the casting of them into new an aggressive forms. The avowed aim of this renais sance is to establish the right of the religions t be the fulfillment of the religious aspirations of th peoples whom they serve, to replace or displac their numerically small but much feared opponent Christianity, and, more remotely, to lay thei claims upon peoples holding other religious loyal ties.

For the Christian mission and for the Christia Church in these lands this development is awesom but challenging. It means that Christianity ther must stand on its own feet and live and grow on it own spiritual merit. There must therefore be o the part of all concerned a new penetration of th ancient religious systems, a theological penetration a religio-theological confrontation that must be a serious and sustained as that engaged in in bring ing into being the classical formulations of Prot estant theology over against Roman Catholicism Perhaps the day has come that for the first tim Christianity and the religions will really meet. Th brunt of this meeting must be born by the younge churches. Their vitality, their ability to interpre Christianity to their neighbors, will be put to th test as never before. Preaching and teaching mus take place within a witnessing and "demonstra ing" community, lest Christianity become a pe culiar religion of little enclaves of believers shu ting themselves out from the indigenous environ ment in which they live. And the missionarie from the West are challenged to bend their minc and hearts more than has up to now been th case to that task of theological and philosophic penetration, the results of which can help th younger churches to enter fruitfully into the re ligious communication and confrontation that mu be pursued if the gospel is to progress in an alie environment.

II. Triumphant Nationalism and the Accompanyi Independence of the Younger Churches

The rise of nationalism and the independence the younger churches can be distinguished fro the resurgence of the ancient religions; they ca not be separated from it. All are part of the lar er pattern of the self-assertion and insistence c self-determination of the former Western dom nated world areas. Each of these factors mus however, receive some separate consideration. W have looked at the resurgence of the ancient r ligions. Let us now consider the fact and the mi sionary significance of the portentous phenomen that we know as nationalism and its reflection the independence of the younger churches.

The post-World War II era has seen one of the most momentous developments in modern world history — the retreat of the West from its more than three centuries old dominance as a world power or, more correctly, as a group of world powers, and the achieving of full independence on the part of the once colonial countries. In the great missionary areas alone it is an impressive list of newly independent nations that must be enumerated: Cambodia, Ceylon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Laos, Malaya, Pakistan, Sudan, Thailand, the Philippines. In the Middle East and North Africa the following have during the past decade joined the U.N. as full-fledged nations: Israel, Jordan, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, and Yemen. All of these, involving hundreds of millions of people, have claimed the right to steer their own course and have seen their claims honored, either because of force of arms employed or through prudent statesmanship on the part of the former colonial powers, and they have been received into the community of nations.

It is necessary from a Christian point of view to understand nationalism correctly as a force in the life of the contemporary world. It is not unusual to hear nationalism lumped together with Communism as an evil afflicting human society. No greater mistake can be made than to make such an association. Communism is ideologically and inherently anti-Christian. Its view of God, of man, and of the world can never be squared with the Christian view of God, man, and the world. The benefits that are created by it are always by-products of a world and life view that is repugnant to Christian conceptions. Nationalism, on the other hand, is inherently good and legitimate. It is an expression of the human spirit that arises from the innate God-given urge to be free, to live and plan and toil as a nation without the restraints that even the most beneficent colonial power must exercise in order to maintain itself as a colonial power. The painful excrescences that too often attend nationalistic self-assertion arise in part from the resistance, whether rightly or wrongly, given it by the colonial power, in part out of the inability of men always to fight for the right in right ways. The rise, struggle, and triumph of the American labor movement is a well-nigh perfect parallel case in our own society. No one can say that the labor movement was consistently angelic in pursuing its aims, but neither can anyone in his right mind deny the legitimacy of its claims and aspirations to a fully equal place with the owners of production in the American economic structure. To deny the nationalistic strivings of other peoples means to repudiate the insistence on liberty and self-determination which are the foundations of our own nation. It also means to brand as hypocrisy the oft reiterated aims of former and present colonial powers to prepare their colonies for nationhood. That the colonies often differed with the colonial power as to the time and manner in which freedom should be granted was perhaps an inevitable result of the Western-sponsored preparation for nationhood.

We must note that in general the Christians in the recently emerging nations supported fully the struggles of their countries for independence. They did this, in the first place, because they are as fully Indians, Philippinos, Indonesians, etc., as their non-Christian neighbors. In the second place, they fully realized that their future as an indigenous church wholly integrated into the life of the nation was doomed if they sided with the West in the struggle for independence. The identification of Christians with the nationalist cause had an ecclesiastical reflex effect. Man is a unity, and not least the Christian man. It is not possible for the man to be politically free and to assent to ecclesiastical control from a distance, however paternal the control. Hence the rise of the independence of the younger churches — a movement now nearly complete in Asia and growing apace in Africa.

It must, I think, be said to the credit of the missionary community that it read the signs of the times ecclesiastically far better than did its compatriots politically in the Hague, Quai d'Orsai, and London. There have been few, if any, unhappy ruptures between sending churches and younger churches on the question of the latter's independence. Missionary statesmanship here has on the whole been high, and we of the churches of the West need not accuse ourselves of boasting when we say that God has given us the grace to impose the bonds of self-limitation which the new situation required.

At this point a striking contrast must be drawn between the church situation in Asia and in Africa. This contrast came to dramatic expression at the recent meeting of the International Missionary Council at Accra, Ghana.

The recent meeting of the I.M.C. at Accra, at which it was my privilege to be present, was a most interesting and significant one. There was one majojr all-overshadowing issue before the assembly. It was this: Should or should not the I.M.C. merge with the World Council of Churches? When the W.C.C. came into being in 1948, and in planning prior to that, it seemed wisest that the two organizations should remain separate but "in association with" one another. It soon became apparent that this was easier said than done. The W.C.C. as a council of churches could not altogether remain away from missionary concerns. On various fronts, especially in the field of research and

study, the two organizations began to overlap. Increasingly, too, on the theological front, it became clear that mission no less than unity belongs to the nature of the church. On the other hand, there were charges from groups not involved in the contemporary ecumenical movement that this was another step in the direction of a monolithic ecclesiastical world structure. These, however, were not the determinative factors in the debate that took place at the Ghana meeting. The debate in Accra, which lasted for several days both in committee and in plenary session, was essentially a debate between ecclesiastically independent Asia and still missionarily dominated Africa. Europe, North America, South America, and Australia took full part in the discussion, but their participation was overshadowed by the issue as it crystallized in the Asia-Africa difference of opinion and this difference was a fundamental one.

What was this issue? This issue was that the Asian churches no longer wished to channel their witnessing outreach, insofar as it is of an ecumenical or cooperative nature, through a *missionary* organization. Not until I attended the Ghana meeting did I fully realize how loaded and freighted a term the word "missionary" has become. It is in the minds of many younger churches inseparably identified or associated with the white man, the West, the churches of the West, and even to an extent with the colonialism that has now been overcome and expelled from Asia. The Asian churches, fully conscious of their independent status, no longer wish to be associated with a *missionary* organization. They wish to act as *churches* and through a council of churches. *This* issue, not questions of administration, theology, or monolithicism, set the tone for the debate.

The one world sector from which massive opposition came to the merger was Africa, that Africa, namely, which stretches from the Sahara to Southern Rhodesia. Again, never until I came to Ghana did I appreciate how far Africa is behind Asia ecclesiastically. Whereas all the Asian representatives save one were nationals, and that exception present only as an alternate to a national who could not come, the bulk of the African representatives were missionaries. African representation at Ghana, particularly from the point of view of influential expression, was white — European, British, and American. African representation by nationals seemed only incidental. It was these missionaries who pleaded for the continuance of the status quo. And still, even they saw the hand-writing on the wall also for Africa, and so they pleaded for non-merger "at this time." Of the twenty-eight delegates who spoke on the issue in plenary sessions, only one got an applause, and that loud and long. He was Sir Francis Ibiam, an Africa observer from Nigeria, who agreed with the general point of view as expressed by representative for Africa but he did so only "in view of the situation," as he politely put it, and left little doub that when the African churches would reach th independence of their Asian sisters they woul take a similar position.

The Church in Asia has come of age, and in th rapidly self-asserting Africa it is only a question o time before its church too will do so. The mission ary implications of this situation are great indeed The national and ecclesiastical movement to inde pendence has brought, is bringing, or will soo bring to an end missions in the form in which w have known them. That is to say, the day is rap idly passing in which missions can exercise th more or less unilateral initiative, decision, and con trol which they have historically exercised. Tw new momentous and most closely related dimen sions have come into being which have radicall altered the old missionary picture — the fully in dependent young nation and the fully independen young church.

This leads us to a discussion of a new, unlooke for, but increasingly significant phenomenon o the missionary scene.

III. Missionary Frustration

There has never been a time when missions, ser ously pursued, have not been beset by a host of vex ing and challenging problems. Until recently, how ever, it could not be said in any significant wa that the missionary enterprise was itself a prob lem, that missions were a problem *to themselve* That time is now upon us. In many and significan missionary areas the place and function of the mis sionary enterprise as traditionally understood i under critical re-examination, and in time *all* th churches of the West will be necessitated by th sheer force of circumstances to engage in suc re-examination and in the readjustments for whic the re-examination will call.

The independence of the younger churches i broadly speaking, the result of two massive fac tors: One is the self-assertion of the former colo nial areas, some aspects of which we noted in th renaissance of the higher religions and the attain ment of national independence. The second facto has been alluded to but needs fuller recognitio here. It is the dreaming, planning, and strivin for the creation of fully independent churches o the part of the missionary bodies. The one facto arose outside of and with little regard to the Chris tian community. The other arose within and be cause of the nature of the Christian community Were we to single out one man whose spiritual in

ight and theological discernment most clearly laid pon the missionary enterprise of the church the laims of this independence we would undoubtedly hoose Roland Allen, the great British missionary hinker, now of blessed memory. There can be no uestion that it is this spiritual planning and rayer for the realization of the end of true mis- ionary work, namely, the independence of the mis- ionarily founded churches, that accounts for the act of the relative painlessness and gladsomeness f heart with which the independence of the young- r church has been recognized and welcomed by all oncerned.

The achievement of a long cherished aim brings vith it, however, an unenvisioned problem of great nagnitude. Having labored to bring into being a ully independent and fully indigenous church, vhat, now that that aim has been achieved, do the nissions in the areas where this realization has aken place, do with themselves? There cannot vell be, as a matter of permanent policy, two equal- y independent witnessing authorities operative in he same area — the missionary authority and the cclesiastical authority. Not only would this raise leep problems of mutual relationships and respon- ibility, but it would call into question the true ndependence and the true indigeneity of the hurch. Particularly would this be the case where he missionary authority stands indirectly as a ymbol of a power and of a domination that have een rejected.

On the other hand, it is inconceivable that the nissionary outreach of lands where Christianity is vell established should cease being made to areas where, however independent the church, only an extremely small percentage of the population ac- knowledges Christ as the Savior of men.

The problem is perhaps best put in this paradox- ical way: (a) the authority of the independent church is inalienable, is non-transferable, and can- not admit, as a permanent arrangement, the co-ex- istence or the parallel existence of a non-indigenous missionary authority; and (b) the right and duty of Western churches to witness to Christ is equally inalienable and non-transferable and cannot admit of a voluntary withdrawal from the witnessing task in non-Christian areas in which the resources of the younger churches are not as yet adequate to that task. There is no greater problem confront- ing missionary and ecclesiastical statesmanship today than the reconciliation of these two seeming- y incompatible claims, both of which arise from the nature of the gospel and of the Church.

The profundity and extent of the adjustments which this situation calls for are indicated by the following changes which in important areas have been effected or are being contemplated:

(1) Changing the term "missionary" to "fraternal worker." The intent of this change is to eliminate, at least terminologically, the connotation of for- eign authority traditionally associated with the word "missionary."

(2) The disbanding of missionary conferences on the field insofar as such conferences bear upon the formulation of policies to be pursued by the mis- sionary body.

(3) The integration of the fraternal workers into the structure of the younger church and their acknowl- edgement of its authority with respect to their Christian life, their assignment of work, and the supervision of it.

(4) The transfer to the younger church of all mission- ary property.

(5) Financial contributions by Western churches for the work of the fraternal workers and for other purposes to be made directly to the younger church.

(6) The authority of the sending church to be ex- pressed largely or wholly in consultative fashion.

The whole matter was put to me at Accra in a nutshell by the representative of a large Asian church when he said, "We are willing to receive the help of missionaries from (country X) if they are willing to work under us."

The adjustment which this situation requires in the thinking and attitudes of the missionaries and their boards in the areas affected can hardly be imagined. A long held control and primacy must be surrendered and a wholly new authority must be recognized. It is small wonder that the word "frustration" is beginning to enter into missionary conversations, conferences, and writings. Some missionaries feel they are no longer really wanted, others that they no longer have the place in plan- ning and execution to which they are used and which they consider essential to the discharge of a fruitful ministry, still others that they are being assigned tasks that do not require the exercise of their full competence.

In general it may be said that there are three main areas of tension: (a) between the younger churches and the missionary authority at home; (b) between the missionaries and the younger churches; and (c) between the missionaries and their boards. The focal center of the tensions is undoubtedly the missionaries. It is in them that the major adjustment must take place. It is they who must bear the brunt of any changes effected in the achievement of a new formula for the regu- lation of missionary activity. The danger is not imaginary that the younger church will emphasize its authority at the expense of missionary status and function, and that home boards in their plan- ning will lay down general policies which do not give adequate weight to the concreteness of the local situation in which their missionaries are in-

volved. In either case it is the missionary who is caught between the two centers of authority.

More than this outline of the missionary dilemma cannot now be given. Two observations, however, would seem to be in order:

(1) While the missionaries personally and collectively must consider it an inescapable part of their missionary duty to recognize the new day that has come and to accept the change in status which it requires, both the younger churches and the missionary authority at home must recognize that no new forms of cooperation can succeed if they do not command the respect and internal consent of the missionaries. Their sense of calling, their feeling of worth and missionary dignity and integrity must be safeguarded by every means which the developing situation allows.

(2) The Christian Reformed missionary enterprise, particularly in the large work in Africa, has not yet been radically confronted with the demands of the new situation. The time when this will have to take place is not far distant. Wisdom would seem to suggest that as a missionary community, both at home and on the field, we study sympathetically the struggles that others are now passing through. The conflicts and dilemmas in which brethren in other areas now find themselves can be made to have a vicarious worth when we, in learning from them, condition ourselves for the self-limitation that will have to be imposed, and for the re-orientation to the whole manner of the discharge of our missionary obligation that will have to take place sooner or later.

IV. Theological Education

It will not be difficult to see that the developing situation as it has been briefly set forth in the foregoing lays very heavy responsibilities on the leadership of the younger churches. The confrontation with paganism and renascent Mohammedanism, the demands of independent church life, providing the spiritual equipment of the church to live and witness worthily in its environment, and the continuing needs for the indigenization of the church make the preparation of a well instructed ministry one of the highest priorities in missionary concern. Men with a full theological education, let alone those who have gone on to post-graduate study, are as yet relatively few in Asian countries and in Africa they are virtually non-existent. Since the churches themselves are as yet unable to provide leadership in this field, the need for missionary contribution on the front of theological education has therefore in no wise diminished.

Throughout the missionary world the theological education that is required is being conducted largely in a cooperative framework. This means that various denominations, frequently of diverse theological background, unite in the founding and administration of a theological school. This to us unusual phenomenon is caused by three factors which are operative in missionary areas in varying degrees of intensity. One is the ecumenical movement which has been strong in this respect particularly in Asia. Two other factors have probably been of greater weight, and that is certainly the case in Africa. The first is the numerical minority of Christians nearly everywhere, which makes the several Christian groups in a given area look to each other for support. Perhaps nowhere is this more strongly the case than in our own African missionary area in Northern Nigeria where 350,000 Christians live among 19,000,000 Mohammedans and pagans. The other factor — and great significance must be accorded it — is that everywhere the younger churches manifest a distinct disinclination to accept Western denominational and theological divisions as legitimate bases for strictly denominational theological instruction.

If we believe seriously in the autonomy of the younger churches, if we sympathize with the herculean evangelistic task before which they stand, and if in this attitude of the younger churches toward cooperative effort we discern, as I am strongly inclined to do, a new leading of the Holy Spirit which constitutes a rebuke of the frightening and hopeless fragmentation of the Church of Christ in the West, we shall think twice before we insist on imposing on them the patterns that have grown up among us in the course of our own characteristic history.

Everywhere missions have been markedly blessed in planting the gospel and in bringing into being vital manifestations of the Church of Christ. In few areas, if any, have they succeeded in establishing, in any pregnant sense, duplications of their own distinctive theological patterns.

Theological patterns will undoubtedly develop among the younger churches too. But they will be their own patterns, arising, as ours have among us, out of the concrete conflicts, trials, and confrontations which the history of the Church brings with it.

* * * *

With this we must conclude this all too brief survey of the world missionary situation today. We leave the younger churches, in all their varied environment, with all their struggles, disappointments, weaknesses, triumphs and defeats, hopes and fears, in the compassionate hands of their omnipotent and ever living Lord who, Himself in weakness made strong as He confronted the cross, said to them, and to us, "Fear not, little flock, it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom."

The Church Order Revision

by George Stob

BY decision of the Synod of 1952, the Christian Reformed Church undertook a revision of the Church Order which has governed the life and work of the church since her origin in 1857.

The Church Order is, essentially, of even longer standing. It may be said to have originated with the beginnings of the Reformed churches in the Netherlands in the Reformation period. The first form of the Church Order appeared in the articles of the Convent of Wezel, an assembly of Dutch churchmen who met in a city on German soil in 1568. After its development in several subsequent and more official gatherings, the Church Order achieved a fully developed and definitive form in the great Synod of Dort, meeting in 1618-19. For this reason the Church Order governing in the Reformed churches has consistently been called the "Church Order of Dort."

An earlier revision was undertaken by the Christian Reformed Church in the year 1904, at the same time that a revision was in process in the Gereformeerde Kerken of the Netherlands. The Netherlands revision was completed in 1905. Even though the Christian Reformed Church at that time used the Dutch language in all her official documents and assemblies, it was judged that the revision of the Netherlands' churches could not be taken over since it was not wholly suitable to the needs of the American church. The Christian Reformed Church therefore undertook her own revision, which was completed, after many years and several changes in committee, in the year 1914.

Why This New Revision?

It may well be understood that revisions in a document of fundamental church law (such as the Church Order is) are not likely to be radical and will come very slowly. For one thing, fundamental church law, based on Scriptural principles, is almost as resistant to change as the basic tenets of a church's theology. Furthermore, the need for stability in the church's structure and life makes it unlikely that frequent or drastic changes in church organization or administration will occur. And finally, traditional attachment to an old and revered document weighs against significant change, not the least in a document as venerated as the Church Order of Dort.

A Church Order, however, is after all only a human and quite fallible document. And since it deals with matters of practice and procedure rather than with matters of faith and doctrine it is certainly more amenable to change than a church creed. This is especially true of a document governing church practice which dates back as far as 400 years, to the period of the Reformation, and which has had its origins in a country located on another continent. The Church Order of Dort arose in a religious and cultural and social situation different from that prevailing in our day and land, and was composed by a people whose experience and religious temper differs from that of people living in modern America. There are provisions in the Church Order of Dort not meaningful or relevant for church life in our day, and which were not removed from the revision which was adopted in 1914. And it might be assumed that over the years new theological insights, new wisdom from years of church life and practice, and new experiences and needs, might suggest desirable or essential changes in or additions to a Church Order.

Whether, and in how far the Christian Reformed Church was governed by considerations such as these is hard to say. The particular circumstance which occasioned our undertaking this new revision of the Church Order was a communication from the Gereformeerde Kerken in the Netherlands in 1950, asking for judgment about revision of the Church Order and a statement of our willingness to cooperate with them in such a revision. In response to this communication the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church decided in 1951 to join in such a revision effort, and in 1952 appointed a committee with a fairly detailed mandate to engage in such revision work. That Committee completed its work in 1956, and published its proposed revision in *The Banner* of November 30 and December 7, 1956, inviting suggestions and criticisms. Taking into account such suggestions and criticisms as were received, the Committee made some changes in its own recommendations, and submitted to the Synod of 1957 the complete text of a proposed Revision of the Church Order of Dort. The Synod of 1957 decided to postpone action on the adoption of the Revised Church Order for another year, meanwhile asking for study and reaction on the part of the churches.

It is no easy thing to provide a respectable and meaningful revision of a document as fundamental

as a church's constitution. The Committee has had a very big job on its hands and has certainly worked very hard at it. It ought perhaps to be said that the Committee should have been better served by the church and her periodicals. It is gratifying to know that the Committee did receive some reactions to the revision which it set before the churches in 1956. In many instances, no doubt, consistories and Classes have found themselves too preoccupied with other things, and for other reasons not wholly competent to serve the Committee with helpful official comments. It is unfortunate that there has not been a thorough public discussion of the Revised Church Order in our church papers, since public discussion has great value in matters calling for community judgment and decision. To my knowledge not one of our church periodicals has attempted any kind of an evaluation of the Church Order Revision. With apologies for being so very late in doing so, *The Reformed Journal* ventures to give expression to some reactions in this issue, with the possibility of further reaction appearing in later issues.

I propose in this article to make some general observations about the Church Order Revision, reserving for another time comment upon certain specific provisions and characteristics of the Church Order and its Revision.

What Canons of Judgment?

It seems to me a serious defect that in undertaking an effort so major as that of a wholesale revision of the Church Order, the actual work of revision was not prefaced by a definitive study and statement of the genius, function, and purpose of a Church Order. In connection with that there might very well have been a statement of the governing principles concerning what ought to be included and what ought to be excluded from the Church Order. And it would not have been unprofitable if the Committee had given some statement of the history of other, at least more recent, revisions, and the problems there confronted.

The work of revision to which the Committee was appointed, and which the church was called upon to evaluate, provided a splendid occasion for giving to the whole church community a study of the principle of a Church Order in an existential context. And the work of revision is surely most effectively and fruitfully accomplished if it is done and evaluated and ultimately adopted in terms of clear and appropriate standards of judgment.

Presumably the Church Order is a legal document, and intended to provide a set of basic rules by which the life and practice of the church is to be ordered. It is not certain, however, that the changes introduced into the Church Order by this revision have been carefully governed by the consideration that the Church Order is a legal instrument. A will be pointed out at another time, there are pro visions in this Revised Church Order which seem t shade off from rules into counsels, into simpl judgments concerning what may be considered de sirable or recommended, into statements of obviou ethical judgments for which no church rules ar necessary, and into exhortations concerning wha may be considered good. In some instances it ap pears that there are provisions which could rathe be left in the category of Synodical regulations subject to change, rather than in the category o basic rules of a more permanent character. And i some cases it appears that contemporary issue which are yet somewhat in dispute or at least fluid are suddenly elevated to the status of Churc Order requirement.

These are some of the things which occasione some difficulty in the earlier revision decided upo by the Synod of 1904. After many years of no too fruitful effort, the Synod of 1912 finally gav to the Committee on Revision a mandate whic called for the observance of certain specific con siderations, among which the following are note worthy:

(1) That the Committee make no new articles o changes with reference to matters in dispute.

(2) That the Committee carefully distinguish betwee the Church Order as such and ecclesiastical regu lations.

(3) That the Committee make its draft as short a possible. (*Acts* 1912, Art. 62, pp. 49, 50).

Whether the present Committee on Revision wa governed by similar canons of judgment or not, w do not know. The Committee has not disclosed th standards of judgment by which it was governe in its work. We are left, indeed, without knowledg of the rationale behind such changes as were in troduced and the rather extensive additions tha were made to the Church Order.

It is true that the Committee did operate wit certain clearly specified directives given in th mandate of the Synod of 1952. They were the fol lowing:

(1) That the proposed revision shall seek to retain th venerable Church Order of Dordt (1618-19) as t its general order and the number of articles.

(2) That the proposed revision shall present an im provement of the wording of the present redaction which in several instances is obsolete or not clea However, all needless changes shall be studiousl avoided.

(3) That insofar as situations of sufficient importanc have arisen in the life of the churches which ar not covered by the rules of the present Churc Order, the proposed revision may include addition to certain relevant articles, as long as these are i

accordance with the Scriptures, our Reformed principles and present established ecclesiastical practice.

(4) That this proposed revision shall be undertaken in close cooperation with the Dutch and possibly the South African churches but without binding the committee necessarily to incorporate the fruits of the labor of these others. (Cf. *Acts* 1952, p. 35).

It will be observed, however, that none of these bear upon basic principles for the selection of matters to be included in or deleted from a Church Order, and therefore do not help to resolve the problem above referred to.

One of the directives required that the Committee should undertake the revision in close cooperation with sister Reformed churches in the Netherlands and South Africa. There was, indeed, consultation between the Committee and those churches. The Committee states: "We have benefited greatly by their work."

But it is something of a loss that the Committee did not share with the rest of the church the information received concerning revisions in the Netherlands and South Africa. It would have been most profitable if there were some opportunity to see what revisions were being considered by these churches and on the basis of what standards of judgment. This would have provided a larger perspective for an evaluation of the proposed revision. And, indeed, the Christian Reformed Church would be undertaking a revision of the Church Order in cooperation with sister churches only if the work and procedure of the other churches were made known to the church at large. We have in another crucial instance suffered from the fact that consultation sought with sister churches was carried on only within the limits of a Study Committee. This is neither proper nor profitable, and it is to be hoped that there will be some way of making possible a full consultation between the *churches* in the matter of Church Order revision.

The Revision Is Too Long

It has been said by Van Dellen and Monsma in their Church Order Commentary: "One of the characteristics of our Church Order is its brevity. There are only 86 articles and these are in most instances very brief. Our fathers purposely steered in the direction of brevity. They believed that the best interests of the churches and the cause of God would be served by a limited number of rules. They feared 'rule upon rule and precept upon precept.' They felt that multiple and detailed rules would bind the churches needlessly." (Preface, p. viii).

This insistence on brevity was a strong point in the mandate given to an earlier revision committee by the Synod of 1912. That committee was instructed to make its revision "as short as possible." Brevity is both possible and required because the Church Order is a document setting forth fundamental constitutional church law. As was observed by the committee reporting in 1912: "The Church Order serves, as the name suggests, and as appears from Article 1 of the Church Order of Dort, 'to maintain good order in the church of Christ.' It does not attempt to regulate everything, but only gives general rules, comprising only that which is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of order and right in a general way, while all other matters are left to the freedom of the churches and to the normal demands of life. For that reason it must be as short as possible, and there is no place in it for those things which would bind the minor ecclesiastical assemblies any more than is absolutely necessary. The only thing it intends is to make possible a well-ordered common life of all churches in the same denomination." (*Agenda* 1912, p. 2).

The present revision Committee has not been highly successful in the matter of achieving brevity. The proposed new Church Order is, in fact, very long. A fairly accurate count shows the old Church Order containing 4400 words, as over against 5900 words in the revised form. This is an increase of 1500 words — a very considerable increase in a Church Order, and quite radically other than the decrease that might have been expected. In view of the fact that this large increase in length has occurred in spite of the deletion of several obsolete articles, the increase stands under the greater suspicion. Has the venerable and respected Church Order of Dort been so deficient, or have circumstances in the life and practice of the church so radically changed over the years, that so many new provisions are needed in a document of basic church law?

The inordinate length of the proposed revision suggests the need of a more careful scrutiny before we undertake to adopt it. Does the revision contain more rules than are absolutely necessary? Does it reach beyond the scope of what is proper to a Church Order and lean too much in the direction of an imposition upon the freedom of the churches? Does it incorporate within itself too many foreign elements — such as exhortations, counsels, suggestions, judgment on contemporary issues yet fluid? Are the articles of the revision too verbose, and do they fail to do justice to the requirement that the language of a legal document should be exact rather than discursive?

The proposed revision surely needs, as the Committee itself recognizes, a close and more critical look before it is finally adopted. We hope to take closer note of some of its features in another article.

On Educating for Freedom

by Ronald Jager

THE ENDS AND MEANS OF EDUCATION seem to be enjoying a rather unusual vogue just at present. Ever since the dark shock of October 4, in fact, our academic antennas have seemed to be informing us that the launching which "progressive education" gave to this country never did quite succeed in getting us into orbit. Whether all this beeping and beefing will signify anything is yet uncertain perhaps; but what is not uncertain is that, in the midst of it, Mr. Lester DeKoster's recent article ("Education for Freedom," *The Reformed Journal,* February, 1958) comes with all the surprise of a swear word from a revival meeting. As the man once said, Whither are we rowing, beloved?

There is much of course in Mr. DeKoster's provocative article that is good to hear, and better to reflect upon. Particularly well taken is his insistence that there is neither in fact nor in principle a true curricular division represented by the distinction "practical-theoretical" or by the distinction "vocational-intellectual." Again, the fifth point which he adduces for his argument — the importance of the priestly character of work — certainly this too is as timely as it is seminal and persuasive. Indeed, the very conception of offering specifically religious reasons for vocational courses is itself almost completely novel and worth at least an honest argument. This much at least, and much more perhaps, of Mr. DeKoster's piece is straight *A* material.

But some of the rest, I am going to say, is *C* minus stuff. So that is what I shall pounce upon. I want — at the risk of distorting the whole — to isolate for scrutiny a single strand of his discussion. And if I thereby provoke Mr. DeKoster into amplifying his ideas, we shall all be the gainers.

AS I READ IT, the logical heart of the argument moves something like this: Education is for freedom; freedom is threefold, religious, intellectual, and vocational. Rightly emphasizing the first two, our curricular thinking tends to ignore the third. Constructive lines for correcting this omission would consist in the introduction of "practical" courses into the secondary curricula, and perhaps new application of them. Now, I am concerned with the logic of the move from the minor premise that freedom (with all its rich connotation) is also vocational to the conclusion that we therefore ought to accept courses in printing, homemaking, and the like. For even with all the weight of Mr. DeKoster's careful argument this conclusion is at least not obvious; it may not even be correct.

I sense a species of objection which is primarily practical, pragmatic, even expedient. (Mr. DeKoster agrees with me, I am sure, that no argument necessarily gains in respectability in proportion as it avoids these terms for their opposites. Why do we tend to think it should?) Consider this suggestion:

"It is expedient that we teach Cicero's Latin to a high school freshman who is bound for college; it is not expedient for this same school to teach his friend how to operate a Sears Roebuck lathe. There is a pragmatic justification for the high school sophomore's studying Homer's gods; it is impractical to teach his friend how to feed cows. It may be practically wise to require a junior to memorize 'Thanatopsis'; it is not feasible for the same school to teach his brother how to operate a Kroger supermarket. It is practical for a school to teach a senior logarithms, church history; it is not even possible for the same school to teach others how to assess taxes, do home-mission work."

Why?

The first alternatives have to do with living life; the second with making a living. And is not the crucial point just the factual one that the school is peculiarly adapted to accomplish certain things systematically better than is any other medium? And is not the corollary likewise clear that some institutions are peculiarly adapted to doing just these other things? In a sense this is *obvious;* I shall try to make it *relevant.*

For, as for the jobs of mastering Latin, becoming familiar with mythology, appreciating poetry, learning logarithms and the significance of the Spanish Inquisition, there is no substitute for the school. But as for operating a lathe, feeding cows, buying merchandise, assessing taxes, doing home missions, it just happens that there are better media for learning these things. These better media are of two kinds: a) the home, the farm, the shop, the church; b) the multitudinous array of correspondence courses, on-the-job apprenticeships, night courses, etc. (I am thinking now of everything that ranges from adult speedwriting courses to that mountain of advertisers who support *Popular Science Monthly* and all such.) The point

re is as simple as this: The school just is not a tisfactory practical instrument for assuring the ell defended and well desired vocational freedom. And I confess that I do not find even the rudients of a solution to that practical, and real (and emingly necessary) divorce in Mr. DeKoster's ntalizing bit of sidewalk speculation: "But suppse there were a developing relation between the hools and community enterprises of all kinds: hat an exercise in communal effort, shared by usiness, industry, school and home alike in rearg what is so glibly called the community's 'greatt asset': its children" (pp. 6, 7). As a clarion ll for curricular changes, this note must needs, fear, fall on wooden ears.

Perhaps Mr. DeKoster's reply to this is that I g the question, that his argument just is that the hool ought to be *made into* an instrument for ocational freedom also. To which the rejoinder once again an appeal to the practical fact that t only *is* the school *not* suited for such, but also at it *cannot be made* suitable for such and still main a school. Concretely, now, in what sense ill two high school courses in shop (replacing istory) guarantee vocational freedom better than x months as a tool-and-die or plumber's apprence upon graduation? What can two years of high hool printing courses (replacing geometry) guarntee me vocationally above that guaranteed by a ear's fulltime apprenticeship upon graduation? hat can a course in agriculture (replacing Engsh literature) give me that a summer at an agriltural college cannot? What can a semester of me economics (replacing biology) give me that a nscientious mother and my own curiosity cant? In short — "the man who hates his job beuse he cannot perform well the tasks it involves, e man who dreads the dawn because it binds him routines from which he has no other skill to esape . . . men [who] find long, despairing shadows ast over home and job alike . . . ." (p. 6) — do we onestly believe that the guilty item in this admitedly desperate picture is the high school "practical ourse" that wasn't there? Who is persuaded by so implistic an analysis? Is even its author peruaded?

Here is the point. For the proposed argument to tand, it has to be shown that curricular training *etter* qualifies the student for the challenge of "job etting and job keeping," and for vocational freelom, than does the learning of the same skills hrough other media (e.g., home, shop, correpondence courses, night school, professional apprenticeship, trade schools and the like). Now, not nly has this not been shown, but it would also eem to be palpably absurd for anyone to try to how it. (But does not Mr. DeKoster seem simply to assume it?) Moreover, is it not the case that these latter media are designed *precisely for* the vocational freedom which Mr. DeKoster so well defends?

By contrast, the proposed argument goes: "The school curriculum which is blind to the obligation laid upon mankind to earn its daily bread at the common tasks of life misses the import of the simple truth that eating underlies living." (p. 6). But, one might protest, the curriculum which excluded welding and sewing is *not blind* to any obligation to earn our bread, nor does it deny that eating underlies living. Rather, it simply recognizes that there are other media suited to teaching the mastery of these indispensable matters. Following Mr. DeKoster's cue we might almost as well argue that curricula which omit courses in dating, car care and toilet training are blind to our everyday needs and overlook the fact that knowledge of how to change tires, diapers and girl friends underlies a good portion of our modern living!

Again, "So, for example, one might seek to develop fruitful relationships between, say, machine shop or radio repairing *and* technological history or electronics. A class in printing may be the continuing point of departure for learning the art *and* for understanding the civilization which rests upon the invention of movable type, the rotary press, and offset reproduction. . . . let geometry be learned from surveying fields or lots in the community; geography will arise out of simple maps prepared from the survey. . . ." (p. 8) This type of argument is supposed to preclude that basketful of rhetorical questions which I dumped out three paragraphs above, for the ideal it envisages is that perfect combination of psychological attraction, theoretical learning and vocational training. (It is the proverbial cake: kept, eaten, and made into pudding to boot — a feat, you must remember, which is performed only in the arm chair and never in the kitchen.) And in reply I feel safe in asserting that the *last* man to suggest this educational procedure is the man who has just tried it — granted that he still believes in education. I submit that the fusion of technological history and radio repairing — where the latter is the end and not the means, the goal and not the illustration — is little short of impossible. The high school mind is by nature a one-way street here. Theory to practice, always. Practice to theory, seldom. Only the brilliant student can be enticed to move from the repaired radio to Marconi, Newton, electro-magnetic theory; the others are interested only in another radio. Thus Mr. DeKoster's argument seems to me to have at once *inverted* both the goal of education and educational psychology. (Though exactly his argument, ironically, has been the red

herring of five decades of "educational psychology" so-called. And this despite the fact that it falls victim to John Dewey's own excellent warning: "Nothing can be developed from nothing; nothing but the crude can be developed out of the crude.") Only when the electric doorbell is the *illustration* of textbook principles and their history and not the *aim* of the course — only then will there ever be the desired fusion of theory and practice. Otherwise, there will soon be only the crudity of practice. And this is of course precisely what is implied by the above quoted suggestions. "Practical courses" are in fact the (psycho)logical consequents of the practice-to-theory technique.

A final example: "A hungry man is . . . in bondage to his, and, more, to his family's hunger. Shall the school pretend this is not so? Or shall it give lip service to the fact, but deny it in the curriculum?" (p. 6) So the school does not teach me how to operate an IBM or how to cook Italian spaghetti — but does this fact constitute a denial of my bondage to my stomach? Of course not. What it *does* deny is that the school is the place to learn how to make a living. It does not deny my captivity by my hunger *unless* it has *already* been established that the curriculum is obligated to provide for my eventual livelihood. *But this is what is at issue!* . . . Logicians have a nasty name for that form of argument which assumes and uses as a premise that which has yet to be proved.

I HAVE SAID my objectives were practical, and so they are. But the practical questions they raise bear upon the logic of the theoretical move from "vocational freedom" to "practical courses." Here I slide from practice into principle, and back again. For if we are somehow to deduce the concept "practical courses" from the concept "vocational freedom," as Mr. DeKoster tries to do, the principles which justify the inference must be factually sound. At the very least they must not presuppose that the school is something other than it is, or other than it, as school, can be, or other than it needs to be. Perhaps I see through my glasses darkly, but I do not now think Mr. DeKoster's inference meets these requirements. The logic of the move from "vocational freedom" to "practical courses" necessarily weaves through a rich and difficult array of practical and theoretical problematics, but as Mr. DeKoster presents it, it collides head-on with a mountain of impractical factual matter which, so it seems to me, forces the argument to beg its own question in order to come out on top. And I am inclined to believe further that all the excellent discourse in the world on the "priesthood of toil" will not patch up this broken-backed argument. Of course, that competence at "job getting and job keeping" be taug by Christians for Christian ends is an ideal wh it is not for us to disparage. But that the st to this sacred goal pass through the "practi course" is a view no less vulnerable than the m profane parts of the argument.

Be it admitted, of course, that though he wa practical courses, Mr. DeKoster concedes straig away that he does "not dream that there is ma in vocational subject matters." It is precisely t perceptive concession which makes his article su a difficult piece to throw tomatoes at. Still it m also be said that there are myriad other argume which scream out against "practical courses": t unacquired disciplines and the ungained bro mindedness; the impossibility of adolescent s dents' choosing wisely between "practical" a "theoretical" courses; the inability of the vocati ally trained to use to God-given capacity the leisu hours of his "freedom"; . . . and the much m that oozes from almost every periodical today. B I hurry past all this to add a footnote in anoth vein.

NEITHER MR. DEKOSTER'S ARTICLE nor my lit comment is addressed to that omnipresent a gigantic practical problem, "What shall we do wi the dullards?" (cf. *Atlantic Monthly,* April 1956 they are addressed rather to the question, Wh shall we do with the curriculum? In a sense, v have thereby tacitly suppressed that radical alte native to the status quo, to wit, separate scho for the college-bound. But I should not like to ha this alternative excluded by focusing total atte tion upon the curriculum in the schools that n are. I, for one, do not think the possibility of se arate Christian preparatory schools to be simp the far-off coffee-time dream that it so frequent is. So I presume to voice this unambiguous (b not new) suggestion:

I do *not* suggest that we ought to set up tra schools in addition to our present high schoo This would only confound confusion. I *do* sugge that we ought to organize prep schools in additi to our present high schools. The distinction he is crucial. For the present schools are not n respectable prep schools, and nothing short revolution will turn them into such. And we a know, deep down where it hurts, that this rev lution will never come. But Grand Rapids, f instance, could, right now, support, finance, a staff a Christian preparatory school for its colleg bound. Who of us really believes that anythi major is lacking beyond the *conviction* that th could be done and the *faith* that God would ble the venture?

RESPONSE TO MR. JAGER

. JAGER'S CRITIQUE is fair and provocative. I happy to have the opportunity to expand upon ne of the issues he raises, and I hope that I ceed in being fair to him in return. I hope that explicit discussion of Mr. Jager's comments l implicitly reply to those of Mr. Van Lonkvzen made last month.

t is desirable to emphasize a few preliminaries:

(1) Appending my reply to Mr. Jager's article ther than allowing a month to intervene) is intended to obscure, or to divert attention from, at he has to say. It is simply to facilitate comrison between the two points of view.

(2) Allowing my rejoinder to grow to a length eater than the piece which occasions it is a luxy which I apologetically permit myself because . Jager's appearance in these pages affords me opportunity, which I might otherwise feel liged to forego, to enlarge upon certain themes which I have strong and persistent convictions. is, in turn, welcome to additional space with-t an appendage from me if he desires it.

(3) The inordinate emphasis which this reiteron places upon the vocational aspect of secondy education must not obscure the fact that I, too, cognize that the primary task of the school intellectual in character. What I mean to conid for is the responsibility which the *school* has, a democracy, for making its contribution to all ree (the vocational, the intellectual, and the reious) aspects of preparation for life; and the gument simply got going with the first.

(4) Though I do think that the schools have me way to go before they realize their potential a formative and coordinating factor in the mmunity, I do not care to associate myself with ass condemnations of American secondary educaon, neither that condemnation which emanates om Americans themselves, nor with that critism so freely offered by Europeans, nor, more reently, with that of Americans suddenly awed by, enamored of, the Russian system. The Amerian way of life, and whatever part American hools play in developing it, is, for all its stresses nd strains, a quite unique and wonderful thing. nd I reflect that when the European smiles or eers at American schools, we might feel the sting f it more after he can show that the European ay of raising its youth figures more largely than has hitherto in providing the same relatively eaceful and humane integration of a continent eeming with varied peoples and cultures which e Americans enjoy. As for those who but lately hought every reference to Russia treasonable, and ow find no higher standard than the Communist system for judging American education, let us of course learn where we can, but soberly remember that the answer to dictatorship does not lie along the road of importation of its techniques.

It is true, as our native-born critics assert, that qualitatively American education fails to get the most out of the best; and that quantitatively American education fails to provide the best preparation for the daily life of the most. And it is to this latter, vocational, problem that this discussion is now directed. But as we pursue it, we do well to remember that our American system shaped you, reader and me . . . and Mr. Jager.

(5) I would like first to make some kind of systematic response to the problems raised by Mr. Jager; and then to discuss briefly some of the specific issues he presents, perhaps in a somewhat lighter vein, lest we take ourselves too much in earnest.

As I read Mr. Jager's criticism, he seems to raise three problems: (1) Why should vocational training, even granted its importance for the life of freedom, be provided in the high school? (2) If it were, would vocational courses force other subjects out of the curriculum? (3) Could not other agencies provide vocational training more efficiently or more effectively than the school?

Perhaps this is only the same problem viewed from three perspectives. Let me, anyhow, explain how each looks from my point of view.

Why in School?

(1) Why offer vocational training *in school?*

I have already proposed one reason which I thought Mr. Jager had accepted. It is this: Vocational training for those entering the professions is already offered by the high school. Is it not simply democratic to extend such offerings to those headed for other vocations?

I am not suggesting that everyone take "practical" courses, especially not in lieu of "academic" courses. The subjects required of any given student will always be governed basically by the fact that he must, as I quoted from Dr. Maritain, "become who he is"; that is, he must become "a man." And, of course, no one who speaks thus means that the student must get, say, courage only. He means that the image of God must come to fruition through guidance of church, home, and school. On this we must all stand firm; and for emphasizing this, we turn to Christian education, a concept which includes, but not coterminously, the Christian schools.

Granted that such a "basic academic curriculum" must be required of all, Mr. Jager argues that this is job enough for the school. Let other agencies perform vocational training. To this argument I will turn under point two. Let me try here to es-

tablish that the school has an obligation *to extend its curriculum* to include vocational subjects.

Let us ask: what, generically, is the school?

Is it not that agency established by the community to educate the young for responsible participation in, and leadership of, the life of the community? Unlike other institutions (the church, the home, industrial organization, and such), the school is the only systematic agency expressly designed by, and controlled by, the community to prepare its youth for what I shall call free citizenship, meaning active participation in all aspects of community life: family, vocational, social, civic, and religious. Whatever else education in a democracy attempts (and I venture the guess that most of us are neither certain nor largely agreed as to what an *educated* person *is*), it attempts at least this: preparation for disciplined and fruitful participation in the life of the community in and through those institutions which compose it.

Holding that it is the responsibility of each individual to become a good citizen, in the sense suggested above, our forefathers decreed compulsory universal education. The individual has no choice in this matter, nor have his parents, if he and they wish, as Locke said, to accept the fruits of communal life.

Now, I think that Mr. Jager would hold with me that one of the obligations which the community legitimately exacts of its citizens is that they engage in fruitful enterprise in so far as they are able. If this is so, does then the community have any interest in the *vocational competence* of those citizens? I cannot repeat the arguments which I employed in my previous article, but it is evident, I think, that society *is deeply concerned* in the vocational competence of its citizens, because the life of freedom, of responsible citizenship, rests (as Mr. Jager agrees) *also* upon vocational foundations.

But, if the community *demands* vocational competence, must it not provide, systematically, the opportunity for achieving such vocational competence? Now, the community has, as Mr. Jager points out, many "media" at its behest to aid in the task of vocational training; but it is simply true that only one of them is completely and systematically at the community's disposal: the school. Vocational training governed by any other means will always be, in a democracy, fortuitous, capricious, limited to immediate objectives. The school should (and the schools in many communities now do) employ a wide range of agencies to perform vocational training, but *the ultimate guidance of and responsibility for* such training can only rest upon the school.

To put my point in a sentence: what the community has the right to demand, it has the obligation to make possible; and for *education* it has *only one* agency which *systematically* touches lives of all the youth: the school. And whe this generic concept, *the school*, come to expres in a multitude of little red schoolhouses, or i wide range of parochial and independent inst tions, or in the large "comprehensive high scho proposed by Dr. Conant, the fact remains changed: the community acts educatively thro its schools.

Because the point is fundamental, let me labor it with an illustration; I choose the voca of homemaking, but I might have chosen any several.

Whether or not Mrs. Smith teaches her dau ter the arts of homemaking is, I think we all ag Mrs. Smith's business. But whether or not tilda arrives at the altar with some compete to the tasks of wife and mother *is not only tilda's*, but in a very real sense also *the com nity's business*, particularly when she begins rear a family. It is, we are told, a sociological ism that the kind of families found anywhere the community affect directly and indirectly families found everywhere in the community. H well Matilda has been brought to understand to practice cooking and nutrition, child rearing hygiene, budgeting, sewing and mending, all these and more, is a community concern just really as would be the more obvious social in sponsibility revealed by Matilda's dumping g bage on the sidewalk.

And so the community has a right to insist t Matilda learn good homemaking. Her attitu toward her tasks and her problems, her com tence in meeting them, and the results she achie affect the lives of herself, her husband, her c dren, her neighbors, the school, the church, a (as by concentric waves) ultimately the wh town or city. But if the community demands co petence, it must provide ways to achieve it. I Jager's blithe and sanguine answer will not writes he, "What can a semester of home e nomics (replacing biology) give me that a cons entious mother and my own curiosity cannot?" N all Mrs. Smiths are, as Mr. Jager knows "cons entious." And it is precisely the satisfaction Matilda's curiosity that I propose the school sho provide, if Mrs. Smith is not conscientious. Inde let Matilda's curiosity be broadened and stim lated, *not by dropping biology but by fruitfu integrating it with hygiene.*

For, the community has only one systematic a proach to the problem of providing training homemaking. If Matilda learns much and well her mother's knee, excellent! Let her *drop*, not ology, nor hygiene, but *home economics!* But if s does not learn at home, then of course the sch must provide her with both the opportunity and t obligation to learn homemaking in the classroo

l why anyone should have to belabor the point t families are basic to society, and that keeping m together and 'going ahead' is a full-time and hly skilled task, which should no more be left hance and to curiosity than should be the train- of an airlines pilot, I do not know. What more portant task could a school have than to bolster nemaking in this age? And though some courses home economics are a farce, this no more con- ns the subject than are all subjects condemned the fact that courses in all disciplines are, in case or another, also poorly taught.

Matilda *could* learn homemaking at home, if con- ons are right; and so could Jimmy learn arith- tic at his daddy's knee, if conditions are right. t the school meets social obligations only if it vides for the fact that conditions are often not ht; and I do not suppose that Mr. Jager prefers leave the learning of arithmetic to a "conscien- us" father's guidance, however aided by John- s "curiosity." Neither does he call teaching thmetic the "residual theory" of education.

Nor is provision for learning homemaking in e school so radical a conception. If Matilda's sband is a doctor, lawyer, engineer, or teacher, e community has spent fabulous sums to train n for his vocation; it has established standards performance he must meet; *and it has done all s in or through the school.* To which Mr. Jager, o is preparing for his own vocation in the me manner, can hardly enter serious objection. t why is he so chary of time and money for tilda?

I cannot but wonder what idea of the place of e school in a democratic society animates Mr. ger and those who accept the views he expresses well. He generally gives me a "straight *A*" for minding him that today's schools *do train* men d women for the professions. Does he give his A's" indiscriminately, or has he reflected upon at this means . . . *in a democracy?* It means that e community uses the school to prepare *some* of s citizens for full participation in community life. od and well. But why only *some?* Why does r. Jager want the schools (supported by the total mmunity) to limit systematic vocational train- g only to those headed for the professions? For is is in fact, whatever may be the theory, the fect of the kind of education he espouses.

Mr. Jager knows well that most doctoral candi- ates, like himself, and like me, are — and rightly — persuaded that *after* they have their meal cket on sheepskin, they will then resume (or be- in) their education. If, however, doctoral candi- ates expect this tender and costly consideration om publicly supported education, why should not andidates for other vocations receive it also? In hort, I wonder if Mr. Jager takes seriously the implications of community concern with vocational aptitude, and if he recognizes clearly the implications of democracy in education.

But this leads to point two:

Can the School?

(2) Can the school offer vocational courses and yet remain a school? I take Mr. Jager to mean that courses which he or I regard as indispensable to education might be displaced by more explicitly vocational ones.

There are several possible responses to this.

One would be to ask Mr. Jager what an educated high school graduate is, or should be like; and then to ask him how each course *he deems indispensable* relates to this end product. I would be much interested in his reply, if he cares to make one.

Another way would be to take a long look at the typical academic curriculum, in the light of one's own understanding of what "becoming who we are" is. For this I have no space, but I suspect that much of what Mr. Jager might deem indispensable could be defended as necessary diet for all students only on the assumption that the mind is a kind of muscle which profits indiscriminately by exercise on equations, paradigms, conjugations, translations, and the memorization of dates. I would argue, on the contrary, that the educated mind is formed by the quality of the ideas it *understands* and ideals it serves, and not by the quantity of exercises it has endured; and that education bears no direct relation to amounts of information as such. Risking merely asserting that this is so, I would conclude that the high school curriculum could undergo substantial revision without necessarily threatening its educative values at all, nor losing the "hard core" of academic necessities.

But there is another approach less abstruse:

Need we assume that there is something sacrosanct about the five-day, 30-35 hour school week, hardly nine months per year? Might not the community (and here we *can* learn from the Europeans, including those behind the iron curtain) some day, soon, want to realize more than it does now on its capital investment represented by the time of youth, and by the educational plant, facilities, and trained teacher personnel?

Are not school days a little short and summer vacations a little long? And though perhaps some teachers prefer augmenting their incomes by summer-time house painting, might they not be better qualified to earn extra salary by summer-time teaching?

In short, I would guess that the high school curriculum might be increased by well-nigh one-half (provided that teaching staffs were likewise increased, and salaries lengthened) without impos-

sible strain, by the use of more hours in the course of each year. Thus, a student might not be obliged to choose between the alternatives suggested by Mr. Jager: printing or geometry, shop or history, agriculture or literature, unless his vocational outlook suggested the desirability of such selection; and a core of "academics" could be required of every one. It is not, first of all, a question of available time; it is a question of plan and the will to develop a program.

But this leads to point three.

Ought the School?

(3) Even if room could be found in the curriculum for vocational courses, is the school the agency through which such training can effectively be provided?

The answer to this question lies in how one thinks of the school. Mr. Jager and I do not differ in supposing that the classroom is not the place for many kinds of vocational training. I suggested before that the education of its youth is, or should be, a community enterprise, not met simply by surrendering our children, with a sigh of relief, to the custody of the teacher five mornings in the week. If vocational training is significant, and if the school is the one agency which can systematically provide for it, *the place where such training occurs* will vary according to the kind of skills involved. I am not urging that all vocations which high school students might learn, or begin to learn, should be taught *in* schools; I am urging that they should be taught *under the direction of* the school, whether in or out of the school building.

Typing and home economics can be taught in a classroom, adequately equipped. So, probably, could elementary printing and woodworking, radio repairing and auto mechanics. But whether vocational education be carried on in school, or during relieved time in business and industry, or during summers under school supervision, is simply a matter of emphasis, economy, convenience, and community planning. Such a hope, however, of what I called a "developing relation between the schools and the community enterprises of all kinds" is, writes Mr. Jager, a "tantalizing bit of sidewalk speculation," which in his case, falls on "wooden ears."

Let me ask: *who insures* Mr. Jager that those "other media" he relies upon for vocational education actually do play their role in fashioning young men and women for vocational competence? The school I envision takes the lead in providing for the integration of contributions which the "home, the farm, the shop, the church" and "on-the-job apprenticeships" have to offer. I am wondering what the school Mr. Jager has in mind does in this respect.

Education can go on wherever it is best formed. There is nothing inviolable about school building. From it may radiate a net of "sidewalks" leading each to its own goal, s by way of the college and graduate school, som way of shop, business, or farmyard, but all tow responsible citizenship.

In Conclusion

May I make but a few observations on partic issues Mr. Jager raises?

"*Following Mr. DeKoster's cue we might,*" warns, "*almost as well argue that curricula w omit courses in dating, car care and toilet trai are blind to our everyday needs . . .*"

Reply: (respectfully) They are!

"*and overlook the fact that knowledge of ho change tires, diapers and girl friends underli good portion of our modern living!*"

It does.

But what is this proposed *reductio ad absurd* intended to demonstrate? May I ask Mr. Ja if he really believes that for every normal c who goes to high school it is more important t he take Latin than learn how to "*change ti diapers, and girl friends?*" And if so, why?

* * * *

"*The high school mind is by nature a one-s street here. Theory to practice, always. Practice theory, seldom.*"

Teachers who have come this far will have judge this assertion for themselves, but I wo suppose that most "*high school minds*" are led generalization only by way of many particulars, cluding those that arise in vocational courses.

* * * *

That there "*is no magic in vocational subj matters*" is, writes Mr. Jager, "*a perceptive conc sion which makes his piece such a difficult article throw tomatoes at.*"

This is not perceptive concession; it is sim Calvinism. And if it wards off tomatoes to boot well, thanks. . . .

* * * *

And, finally, there are "*myriad other argume which scream out against 'practical courses' . . .*

This, alas, is true. Though perhaps some of t "*myriad*" lisp more than they scream. But, th all wisdom screamed, too, when old Galileo stepp out on the leaning tower and dropped his weigh . . . . Nor did the screams cease when the weights h the ground in unison. They simply took on anoth key. One has to let some wheels screech and non the-less get the wagon on the road. This, at least, the practical approach.

ERKOUWER *on the Image of God**

by Anthony A. Hoekema

IS PAPER WILL ATTEMPT to set forth the main lines of Professor G. C. Berkouwer's conception the image of God in man, as reflected in his ent study, *De Mens Met Beeld Gods* [*Man, the age of God*], Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1957).[1] This idite work of 416 pages represents one of the st ambitious attempts ever made by a Reformed olar to subject this vital theological concept to roughgoing analysis.

Introduction

At the very outset Dr. Berkouwer places his oblem in a contemporary setting when he de- res that there is today a new interest in man d in the realities of his existence. It is now also alized, moreover, in opposition to earlier periods rosy optimism, that any attempt to explain man art from the evil in him is an abstraction which ls to do justice to reality. The world is becoming creasingly aware of the tragic and demonic ele- nts in human personality. Berkouwer cites the w of man characteristic of existentialism as an ustration of his point — a view of man which is t idealistic but quite realistic, virtually to the int of disillusionment and cynicism. One might most feel that there is in modern existentialism hat of Sartre, for example) a kind of return to Biblical view of man, a kind of recognition of tal depravity. Not so, says Berkouwer; despite perficial similarity there is radical discontinuity tween the existentialist and the Biblical view of an. For existentialism, despite its apparent pes- mism, still believes in man's ability to make the oper choices.

It might be well to ask ourselves at this point hat we can expect from a doctrinal study of man ch as Berkouwer here gives us. Berkouwer makes very clear that it is not the business of theology give us a kind of Biblical psychology. The Scrip- res, he asserts, contain no scientific psychology; hatever psychological terms are used in Scrip- re are not used with scientific exactitude but ith the greatest of variations. An apt quotation om J. A. T. Robinson's *Study in Pauline Theology* . 16) well illustrates the point:

> From the standpoint of analytic psychology and physi- ology the usage of the Old Testament is chaotic; it is the nightmare of the anatomist, when any part can stand at any moment for the whole. [Quoted in Berkouwer, p. 217, note 22].

The purpose of a doctrinal or dogmatic study of man such as the one we are concerned with is not (1) to introduce a distinct type of methodology which will be able to reach aspects of man hidden from the other sciences. Nor is it (2) simply to repeat what has been discovered about man by other sciences. Nor is it (3) to define a special "religious aspect" of man which is to be added to other aspects of man as a kind of pious appendix. The purpose of this doctrinal study of man is simply to see man as he stands in the light of divine revelation (that is, of Scripture). We are to strive to view man in his relation to God. We are to see man as he stands before the face of the Almighty, bound to God religiously in the totality of his existence. (Berkouwer, pp. 26-28).

This relatedness to God, moreover, is not something added to man, not a *donum superadditum*, but is constitutive of man's being. Whoever tries to see man apart from this relatedness to God will always fail to see man as he really is. In this connection Berkouwer makes a comment which sounds a note of caution to all psychologists, sociologists, psychiatrists, physicians, and so on: "The various specific sciences, which all busy themselves with aspects of man, can never give us more than just a partial contribution to our understanding of man; they will never be able to unvail for us the secret of the whole man" (p. 26).

Image of God in Broader and Narrower Sense

The first major problem about the image of God which Berkouwer tackles is the question of whether we may properly speak about the image of God in both a broader and a narrower sense. It has become customary for Reformed theologians to make this kind of distinction when speaking about the image of God. Professor Berkhof, for example, in his *Manual of Christian Doctrine* (which is used as a textbook at Calvin College), following Bavinck, distinguishes between the image of God in a restricted and in more comprehensive sense. The former consists in "the spiritual qualities with which man was created, namely, true knowledge, righteousness and holiness." The image in the more comprehensive sense means that man is "a spiritual being, rational, moral, and immortal; in the body, not as a material substance, but as the organ of the soul; and in man's dominion over the lower creation." (pp. 129f.). It is then usually also

---

his paper was read at the Fifth Annual Convention of ie Christian Association for Psychological Studies, which et at Calvin Seminary on April 9, 1958.

1. The English translation by Dirk Jellema will be pub- ied by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

said that, whereas the image in its narrower sense has been completely lost through man's fall into sin, the image in the broader sense has not been lost but has only been corrupted by sin.

In his second chapter, Berkouwer addresses himself to the question of whether it is proper for us to make this kind of distinction within the image of God. He indicates that the reason why this distinction was made was a twofold consideration: (1) It was recognized that man, though fallen, still remains man; and (2) it was also recognized that man, through his fall into sin, has lost that conformity to God's will which he was able to exercise before the fall. Reformed scholars therefore began to concern themselves with the question of what was not lost through sin. It was this type of discussion which led to the assertion that there is an aspect of the image of God in man which was not lost through sin.

At this point I should like to supplement Berkouwer with a brief digression into scholastic anthropology, since it seems to me that in scholastic anthropology we find the real origin of this distinction between the broader and narrower sense of the image of God. The scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages drew a sharp distinction between the "image" and the "likeness" of God. The "image," so they said, consisted of certain natural gifts with which God had endowed man at creation: the spirituality and immortality of the soul, and, in particular, man's reason or intellect with which he was supposed to rule over his lower passions. However, the scholastics said, even in his original natural state man was not wholly able to subdue his passions by means of his reason; there was continual conflict between the two. Hence, in order to help man keep his lower passions in check by means of his reason, God gave man a *donum superadditum*, an added gift. This the scholastics called man's supernatural "likeness" to God.

What, now, happened when man fell into sin? Man now lost his "likeness" to God, the scholastics said, but retained the "image" of God. That is to say, man lost the *donum superadditum*, the added gift of grace given to help him keep his lower powers in check, but retained the other gifts God had given him at the time of creation: the spirituality of the soul, the immortality of the soul, and, in particular, his reason or intellect.

On the question of what effect sin had on man's reason, the scholastics were rather vague. They certainly did not teach total depravity, as Calvin never tired of pointing out. Their general position seems to have been this: since man has now lost the *donum superadditum*, he is no longer able to check his lower passions by means of his reason. Yet his reason can still accomplish a great deal. Scholastic apologetics ascribes to man the ability to arrive at the existence of God, and to learn a number of truths about God, by means of reason. Man, therefore, still retains his re despite the fall, but his reason has been weake We could perhaps characterize the scholastic of fallen man by saying that man has now bec not *depraved*, but *deprived*.

Here, then, we have the emergence of the that the image of God consists of a narrower as which was lost in the fall, and of a broader as which was not lost, though weakened by Berkouwer questions the validity of this dist tion. He is quite critical of the emphasis on as a being gifted with reason which was so c acteristic of scholastic thought, and which often reappeared in Reformed circles. Tho Aquinas, for instance, the most outstanding s lastic theologian, asserted that the image of Go found in man specifically in his mind or intel whereas in other aspects of man's personality find not an image, but just traces, of God (*vestig* (*Summa Theologica*, I, Q. 93, Art. 6.) Berkou counters by saying that one will never meet a of this sort (a being merely endowed with reason the Scriptures.[2] What one meets in the Scripture a man who stands in relatedness to God. And trouble with all views of the image of God wh begin by positing certain gifts in man, like rea or, for that matter, will, personality, or freedom that they perforce make secondary what the Sc tures make primary: man's inescapable relatedn to God. (pp. 31f.).

Summing up, we could say that the first rea why Berkouwer opposes the traditional distinct between the broader and narrower sense of image is that this distinction tends to make think of man merely in terms of his ontological psychological structure, rather than in terms of relatedness to God. A second reason is the dan of losing sight of man's corruption on account sin. Berkouwer sees in much of the discuss about the broader aspect of the image an attempt find something in man which has not been touch by sin. If I may insert a comment here, perh the gravest deficiency of Roman Catholic or sc lastic anthropology is, it seems to me, its failure recognize the total depravity of fallen man, and consequent overestimation of the power of rea in the unregenerate. This deficiency is, howev tied in very directly with its conception of image of God. The danger of underestimating effect of sin on man has, according to Berkouw not been completely absent from Reformed t ology either. He cites one theologian, A. Kuyp

2. I should like to add that, in my judgment, the sou of this overemphasis on man's intellect lies in Greek phil ophy. It was Plato, for example, who called the intel "the divine part of the soul" (*Timaeus*, 90C); Aristotle li wise called man's reason divine (*Nic. Ethics*, Bk. X, 1177 Cf. my article "Primacy of the Intellect," *Reformed Jour* May and June, 1956.

who distinguished between the *being* and the *ure* of man, and affirmed that, as far as his *ng* is concerned, man still has the image of God, ereas the restoration of the image of God in the enerate takes place exclusively in his *nature*. kouwer asks: But was the *being* of man then npletely unaffected by sin? And is it possible make so sharp a distinction in man between his *ng* and his *nature* (pp. 36f.).

To combat the thought that the image of God in wider sense has not been greatly affected by , he quotes H. Bavinck to the effect that the age in the broader sense has been corrupted and vastated (*bedorven en verwoest*) by sin (p. 38). t then the question arises for Berkouwer whether e expression "image of God in the wider sense" ll has any valid meaning. Has this image still en retained if it has been corrupted and devas-ted? Can one say that man in revolt against God ll bears the image of God? Or must we say that an in revolt is in many ways precisely the opposite the image of God?

On the basis of considerations such as these rkouwer concludes that the two aspects of the age of God, as customarily distinguished, form irreconcilable antinomy, and that therefore this distinction had better be abandoned. He holds that when we try to speak about one type of image which has been lost and another which has been retained, we are attempting to combine two diverse concepts of the image of God into one. Berkouwer would not deny, of course, that man, though fallen, still remains man. But he questions whether we may see in this continuing humanity of man (his reason, his personality, his freedom, and so on), sharply sundered from man's loving and grateful service of God, an analogy to God sufficiently clear to be called an image.[3] (*To be continued*)

---

3. *De Mens het Beeld Gods*, p. 56. A considerable part of the discussion which followed the reading of this paper concerned itself with the validity of Berkouwer's position on this point. It was questioned, for example, whether we can think of the image of God exclusively in terms of *function*, as Berkouwer seems to do, or whether we must also include in it certain elements of personality *structure*. It was asked whether the element of personal responsibility, which remains in fallen man, does not belong to the essence of the image of God. It was asked whether, in Berkouwer's distinction between *humanity as such* (*menselijkheid*) and the image of God there was not also a kind of *donum superadditum* concept — as if the image of God is somehow not identical with man's existence as man but separate from it. The discussion revealed, in other words, that Berkouwer's position on the nature of the image of God, though most stimulating and suggestive, is not necessarily unassailable. There are areas of thought here which need further study and further discussion.

ALVIN ON WORD AND SACRAMENT, ND MAN

alvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, by Ronald S. Wallace. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957. pp. xii-253. $3.50.

alvin's Doctrine of Man, by T. F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957. pp. 183. $3.50.

eviewed by M. EUGENE OSTERHAVEN
rofessor of Systematic Theology, Western Theological Seminary.

In view of the recent veritable flood Calvin studies and the startling re-ascence of Reformed theology in any quarters where for long it was pageant faded," it is interesting to ote in older volumes the lament or gh of relief, depending upon the the-ogical predilections of the writer, at the day of Calvin's influence in urch and theology, is long since st. Thus, in his celebrated lecture *Calvinism* delivered at St. Andrews 1871 when he was rector of that niversity, James Anthony Froude ve his estimate of the reaction of the neteenth century to his subject: Every one here present must have come familiar in late years with the ange of tone throughout Europe and America on the subject of Calvinism. After being accepted for two centuries in all Protestant countries as the final account of the relations between man and his Maker, it has come to be regarded by liberal thinkers as a system of belief incredible in itself, dishonouring to its object, and as intolerable as it has been itself intolerant" (p. 4). And near the close he lamented that Calvin's "name is now associated only with gloom and austerity" (p. 53). At the end of the "age of liberalism" in which Froude delivered his lecture Georgia Harkness could write that Calvin's "theology is in eclipse," that "opprobrium" has settled on his shoulders through the centuries, and that his "name connotes usually a shadowy figure — often a sinister figure — one who believed in predestination and other strange ideas that nobody now accepts" (*John Calvin: The Man and His Ethics*, pp. vii, 259).

The latter judgment wouldn't be altogether surprising to the Reformer were he to hear it for, from the reception which his doctrine received from his enemies in his own time and from his understanding of human nature, he would not have been so naive as to suppose that all future generations would rise up to call him blessed. Dr. McNeill puts this well in his recent volume, *The History and Character of Calvinism*. He reminds us of the celebration of Calvin's death in the city of his birth in 1551, thirteen years before his actual demise. An illness of Calvin, unverified rumor, and wishful thinking, says McNeill, had brought it on. The author continues: "A year later, when Noyon suffered a disastrous fire, Calvin expressed his sorrow for the ruined city, but remarked: 'I survive my birthplace that last year gave solemn thanks for my supposed death.' When he died in Geneva in 1564, an eyewitness wrote that his corpse was 'followed by almost the whole city, not without many tears.'

If You Want the Best and "Best Value"

Baldwin
PIANOS • ORGANS

H. M. VAHEY MUSIC CO.
6 Jefferson Ave. SE, Grand Rapids, Mich.

PULPIT ROBES

You always look your best, are your best in a BENTLEY & SIMON pulpit robe. Hand-sewn and custom-tailored for perfect fit, for lasting enjoyment.

CHOIR ROBES, too, individually made in the same quality way.

Your Standard of Excellence since 1912

Write for catalog F-7

BENTLEY & SIMON Inc
7 West 36 St., New York 18, N. Y.

In these incidents lies a kind of allegory of Calvin's fate in history. He has been execrated and defamed, admired and extolled. His influence has sometimes been jubilantly reported to have expired; but it has survived the authors of the reports. He remains so famous that, as is wont to happen with the great, persons ignorant of his life and work pronounce judgment upon him with the utmost finality. But he will not be thus easily dismissed. It is remarkable that in this age of stress and perplexity, when most people are absorbed in problems that seem far removed from his interests, Calvin's writings have been read with renewed attention and have affected trends and movements in every sector of theological and Christian social thought" (p. 93).

The volumes before us, having come from the pens of two of Scotland's finest theologians and having made their appearance in Great Britain a few years ago, are good examples of the new interest in the Reformer and his theological labor. The doctrine of the Word and Sacrament is important and Wallace's conclusions are based on a careful collation of sages from the *Commentaries*, *tutes*, and other writings. The boo another proof of the importance o *Commentaries* if one is to unders Calvin, for he was a Biblical the gian and one finds in them *in ext* what he reads in summary in the *stitutes*. Wallace does not give critical study but an exposition of subject. He begins his discussion five chapters on Calvin on revelat then there is a like number on Cal conception of the Word, and tha followed by eight chapters on the raments.

There is nothing startlingly new this volume for anybody who has c a substantial amount of reading Calvin. The well-conceived outline careful documentation, however, do press upon one the fullness and st lingly *modern* nature of the Reform treatment. It is full, in that alm every phase of the relevant proble is treated somewhere in his comm taries or elsewhere; and it is mod in that many of the emphases wh have been and are being made in day, and have been received by sc as though they were completely r discoveries, are but a restatement positions held in Calvin's writings. us look at a few of them.

That which has most contributed the theological renascence of the decades is the rediscovery of the Bi as the Word of God, and in this rec covery a few facts have received gr emphasis. One of these is the centr ity of Christ, in revelation. He is sole mediator of revelation in the Testament as well as in the New. K Barth and the authors of a number essays in the World Council sy posium *Biblical Authority for Tod* to mention just some of the ma striking instances that could be cite come to mind here.

Wallace shows convincingly th Calvin held the position that Christ the sole mediator of revelation in bo Testaments (pp. 8ff, 42ff, 61ff). who doubts should check the referenc and read them in context, as this viewer did. Wallace says, "No attem must be made to supplement this re elation by turning away from Chris even for a moment, to explore oth sources of knowledge which might supposed to have something to say ar to give us that might enrich us further (p. 62). "So complete, unique ar

HERALD Summer Bible School Series

A PERMANENT BIBLE-TEACHING VBS CURRICULUM

designed to achieve spiritual results in your community by educating your pupils:

- In the Scriptures
- In Christian Character
- In everyday Christian living and strong personal witness
- With proved lessons
- At his grade level
- With progressive development of Bible themes from one grade to the next—for 13 years

EDUCATIONAL — INTERESTING
ENJOYABLE — PRACTICAL

Herald
SUMMER BIBLE SCHOOL SERIES

Also available in Spanish, German and French.

For complete information write for free illustrated brochure.

At Your Local Bookstore

HERALD PRESS Dept. RJ Scottdale, Pa.

Our 50th Year of Christian Literature Service

lusive is the revelation which God es of Himself in Christ that it is only madness to forsake it for any er source of knowledge but also most base ingratitude, and a rob- y from Christ of His Glory" (p.). Wallace admits, contrary to Barth l others, that Calvin taught general elation (pp. 65f), "that the rays of rist are diffused throughout the whole ation," and that Calvin "even sug- ts that pagan culture and religion e much to Christ" (p. 66). But, be- se of sin, we can never be led to d thereby. The question that we ve concerning this section of the k is whether the Christological em- asis is given at the expense of ade- ate emphasis on the revelatory ac- ity of God the Father and the Holy irit, which are also given prominence Calvin.

Another constant motif of much con- mporary theological literature is its phasis on the unity of revelation. e representative references cited ove could be invoked here as well as ny other recent writings. Wallace, spired by Calvin, has two chapters the subject. The uniqueness of velation is another note being struck equently in our time. Some would y that this is contemporary theol- y's theme song. Wallace devotes a apter to setting forth Calvin's posi- on.

Although talk of a "moratorium on eaching" may still be alive in some rcles, the sacred art has been receiv- g encouragement in many quarters nce Barth delivered his address on The Need and Promise of Christian reaching," given in 1922 and pub- shed in the volume *The Word of God nd the Word of Man.* Barth spoke of the air of expectancy that something reat, crucial and even momentous is happen" when a man stands up to eak the Word of God. Calvin, inter- reted by Wallace, had the same dy- amic conception (pp. 82f.) The hapter on preaching could well be ead by every *verbi divini minister,* though a still more profitable discus- on of Calvin on the subject might be . H. L. Parker's *The Oracles of God,* specially pp. 45ff. One may come om such discussions with the com- ined feeling of exhilaration and of eing a *dud* in his own efforts to reach the "unsearchable riches."

The last half of the book, on the acraments, was most rewarding to this reader. Those of us who are half-Zwinglian in our doctrine of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, perhaps never having read Calvin's *Commentaries,* if we have read the *Institutes,* ought to read Wallace's discussion. It is superb. The chapter on "The Sacraments of the New Covenant as Signs and Seals" shows Calvin's appreciation of these rites as signs of God's grace comparable to the miracles performed in the Old Testament and in the early Church and seals of the Word preached. The sacraments take "the important place which miracles and visions and dreams and all the visible phenomena by means of which God revealed Himself had in the Old Testament times" (p. 137). The key chapter in the entire discussion on the sacraments is entitled "The Mystery of Sacramental Union." It is shown therein that Calvin held that "the function of the sacraments is not merely to produce a healthy psychological effect by depicting to the eyes doctrines and facts that must not be forgotten, but to be the instruments of a gracious divine action whereby what is represented to us is also presented to us" (p. 160). "The sacraments thus deserve to be ranked along with the Word as true means of grace, and along with the Word of the Gospel can be called the *power of God unto salvation*" (*ibid*).

The meaning of the Supper to Calvin is seen to be exceedingly rich. As Baptism signifies the reality of our ingrafting into Christ and cleansing, so the Supper is a real reception of Christ. Calvin agreed with the Lutherans and the Roman Church that the flesh of Christ was offered and received no less than his Spirit so that believers are given the whole Christ (p. 199). However, Calvin insisted, in opposition to these others, that the body of Christ remained in heaven and that communion with him was through the Holy Spirit by whom he, the whole Christ, was received in faith. Wallace takes considerable pains to show that in Calvin's doctrine the Supper was no mere memorial, but an actual communion with and reception of the Saviour (pp. 203ff, 211ff), and that he felt that his doctrine was Biblical. Omitting, for the sake of space, discussion of Calvin's repudiation of Zwingli's over-simplified perversion of the Supper, we note that Calvin felt the Lutheran doctrine was absurd in that it taught that the body of Christ could exist without definite dimensions or space (pp. 221f). The Lutheran notion that Christ's body is given with the bread even to unbelievers was one of the "absurdities abhorrent to piety." And, if Christ's body is now invisible and omnipresent so that it can be locally present in the sacrament, does this imply such a change in our bodies, since his resurrection and glorification was a pattern and the first-fruits of ours (p. 224)? Furthermore, the ascension and second coming of Christ mean that Christ has left this earth and that some day he will come again. Wallace shows that for Calvin these events had deep meaning, whereas for Lutheranism the advent will be merely "the visible revelation of what has been present in this world all the time in a hidden way" (p. 226). In the very nature of a sacrament as a sign our minds are directed away from it to the divine reality which it signifies.

The Strong Comfort of GOD

E. Lee Stoffel. Faith demands everything a man has — its reward is the assurance and strong comfort of God. Here is help for the stress of daily living, for the anxiety that besets our age. In a powerful challenge, Dr. Stoffel calls men to accept the call of Christ, and with it abundant life. **$3.50**

Out of the Whirlwind

William B. Ward. Why do the righteous suffer? Those troubled by great pain or loss will find new comfort in this illuminating study of the book of Job — the story of a righteous man and his search for the reason for his suffering. This is an excellent guide for adult groups and individuals who wish to study Job. **$2.50**

His Kingdom Is Forever

E. Lee Stoffel. From the days of Abraham to the time of Christ, the Bible's teachings about the Kingdom of God are presented here in all their glory. Man is brought face to face with the breath-taking reality of this Kingdom — and his choice concerning it. **$3.00**

ask your bookseller

JOHN KNOX PRESS

"Hence any doctrine of the sacraments that fixes the attention of men on the elements, thus 'withdrawing the minds of men from heaven' and preventing this lifting up of the hearts of the participants, is a triumph for the 'wiles of Satan' who wishes nothing more than to tie the minds of men to earthly things and to prevent them from rising into true communion with God" (p. 228).

Covering, as it does, a wide field of study, the volume is brief in some respects. Chapter eight on "The Written Word as the Word of God" is unsatisfying in its brevity. It would be better to have Calvin's doctrine of inspiration untreated than to dispose of it in such brief space. But if the book is weak here it is excellent elsewhere and will give the spiritual son of the Genevan Reformer new insights and inspiration.

The study by Torrance is what one acquainted with his other writings might expect — thorough, fresh, stimulating and, at times, shocking. Manifesting a masterly knowledge of the material, the author states in his preface that he has sought to "lay bare Calvin's own thought and to present it as far as possible in his own way and in his own words. Traditional Calvinism I have studiously avoided, and have made no reference to works on Calvin, ancient or modern, so that this presentation might be free from the imputation of partisanship in any of the different schools such as that of the Dutch Calvinists, or that of W. Niesel and the late Peter Barth. Consequently, the bulk of the book consists of citations gathered from all over Calvin's works, and arranged together with as little explanatory material of my own as was necessary. I am conscious that in the very arrangement of this material, as also in the exposition, interpretation has been unavoidable, but it is, I believe, in the direction in which Calvin's own thought moves as it is drawn out, particularly in its relevance to the modern theological debate."

The four chapters on the image of God, the two on total perversity, and the final chapters on our knowledge of God have to be read and pondered. They are potent interpretation by an acknowledged master. Calvin's own dynamic position on man as image-bearer, and on the whole subject of God's relation to creation — "from the point of view of his theology Calvin has nothing to do with second causes. All nature, and the gifts and endowments of man, depend for their being upon the immediate agency of God through His Spirit and His Word" (p. 63) — stands out afresh. And the reader may meet a Calvin, *ala* Torrance to be sure, who in places hardly seems familiar. But the question is whether the Calvin one meets here corresponds with *The Theologian* of four centuries ago. After reading Torrance one will be constrained to be careful in his answer.

There are questions which this reviewer has. The total lack of any knowledge of God in man except in the hearts of regenerate Christians is not quite Calvin's teaching; the spiritual-natural distinction made in the discussion on the image of God is a frame of reference which may be questioned; and the discussion on the image, though powerful, did not satisfy this reader in every respect.

The summaries of positions taken, at the head of each chapter, are helpful in keeping the reader from losing his way in the discussion. The reasoning is close and the subject matter is rather heavy. For stimulation and instruction theologs in general, and those of us in the Reformed tradition in particu can hardly do better than procure read these essays by these brothers law whose influence is bound to gr in Reformed theology. The publish are to be commended for bringing these volumes in our country.

CHOIR ROBES
Newest colorfast fabrics available.
Write for Catalog
E. R. MOORE CO.
268 Norman Ave., Brooklyn 22, N. Y.
932 Dakin St., Chicago 13, Ill.
1641 N. Allesandro St., Los Angeles 26, Calif.
Representative in Grand Rapids, Mich.
DIRK VANDER LENDE
35 Fitzhugh S. E. Phone: GL 6-7574

The Princeton Institute of Theology
July 7 - 17, 1958
PRESENTING:
Nels Ferre Martin Niemoell
Norman Goodall Allen Weh
and many others
Registration: $5.00 per person
$7.50 per couple
Board, room, and tuition
$50.00 per person
For details write Donovan Norquist
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Princeton, New Jersey

THE EFFECTIVE CITY CHURCH
by Murray H. Leiffer

Recognized as "an authoritative answer to the question as to how the church can build its program to meet the needs of city living" (*Watchman-Examiner*), this book effectively undergirds the entire ministry of the urban church. First published in 1949, it was revised in 1955 to take into account current census material.

"The author has obviously written with pastors, denominational executives, and alert laymen in mind . . . The intention to provide a volume which is at one time analytical, inspirational, and immediately practical has been achieved." — JOURNAL OF RELIGION

THE SECTIONS: THE CITY AND ITS INFLUENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIFE; URBAN COMMUNITIES AND THEIR CHURCHES; DIAGNOSING THE PROBLEMS OF THE CITY CHURCH; CITY, REGIONAL, AND CHURCH PLANNING.
$3.50

Order from Your Bookstore Today

ABINGDON PRESS
Publisher of THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE